



# County of Yolo

## PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

*John Bencomo*  
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street  
Woodland, CA 95695-2598  
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728  
[www.yolocounty.org](http://www.yolocounty.org)

**TO:** SUPERVISOR MIKE McGOWAN, Chair,  
and Members of the Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** JOHN BENCOMO, Director  
David Morrison, Assistant Director  
Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager  
Planning and Public Works Department

**DATE:** January 20, 21, and 22, 2009

**SUBJECT:** General Plan Workshop and Acceptance of Revised Draft General Plan. (No additional general fund impact for these actions)

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

- A. Receive a presentation on proposed revisions to the September 10, 2008 Draft General Plan including a summary of comments received during the public outreach process.
- B. Accept the Revised Draft General Plan (see Attachment A, Proposed Revised Draft General Plan) as modified by the Board of Supervisors, to be the "preferred project" for purposes of analysis in the environmental impact report.
- C. Given the unique State requirements for the Housing Element (see later discussion), grant discretion to the Director of Planning and Public Works to make final modifications to the Revised Draft Housing Element as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the State Department of Housing and Community Development, unless a substantive land use or policy concern arises. Should the latter occur, staff will return to the Board of Supervisors for additional direction.

### **STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The process of updating the General Plan reinforces the strategic planning process by creating a consistent countywide policy framework for County land use decisions. Upon adoption of the new General Plan, the strategic plan can simply refer to the General Plan goals and policies, and Implementation Plan regarding land use items. Other strategic plan goals that relate to County operations and facilities can continue to stand alone. The General Plan Implementation Plan provides a bridge between the General Plan, the strategic plan, and the annual budget.

Specifically the new General Plan will support the strategic planning goals as follows:

- Financially sustainable county government by including a detailed Implementation Plan that identifies County departments responsible for implementation of each action, estimated costs for implementation, and sets a priority for each action (Goal IN-1).
- Environmentally sensitive and quality county infrastructure, facilities and technology by providing policy guidance for locating county services and facilities within the downtown areas of existing and planned communities, and through the use of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification (Goal CC-2 and Goal PF-12).
- Top quality workforce providing responsive services by establishing minimum services thresholds for existing and planned communities (Goal PF-12).
- Preservation of agriculture and open spaces by identifying where new growth can occur and establishing policies supportive of agricultural and open space land uses (Goals LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3).
- Partnering for a successful Yolo County by reinforcing a policy framework for intra-county coordination (Goal LU-6) and regional coordination (Goal LU-7) on land use matters.
- A safe and healthy community by establishing a policy framework for community design (Goals CC-3 and CC-4) and for safety, noise, and health care in the Health and Safety Element.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The cost for the General Plan Update is a general fund item. The staff and consultant team are operating under scopes of work and budgets approved by the Board of Supervisors in previous actions. The total budget for the General Plan Update process is \$2,154,962. Approximately \$1,885,735 (87.5 percent) of the budgeted amount has been expended over the last five years.

The County has previously been awarded a grant of \$221,000 from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for preparation of the Circulation Element. In addition, the General Plan cost recovery fees collected on building permits total nearly \$700,000 since 2004. This fee was increased in November 2008 from 0.27 percent of building valuation to 0.40 percent. These incoming funds partially offset the actual cost to the general fund for the General Plan Update.

Subsequent modification of the General Plan Update budget will be necessary in order to reflect unanticipated changes in the schedule and scope of the effort. It is anticipated that a contract amendment and budget augmentation will be brought forward for consideration by the Board of Supervisors in February 2009. In general, these changes are expected to include:

- A decrease in the budget for the General Plan consultant (DCE) of approximately \$50,000 to reflect the fact that the General Plan will be completed by the contract General Plan Project Manager with oversight by staff. In addition the DCE contract will be concluded.
- An increase in the budget for the General Plan Project Manager (Tschudin) of approximately \$150,000 to reflect the addition of Delta coordination duties in August of 2008, and General Plan activities through the end of this fiscal year. An additional amendment will be necessary in the first quarter of the 2009-2010 fiscal year to complete the General Plan process.

- An increase in the budget for the environmental consultant (LSA) of approximately \$47,000 for: changes in the analysis of climate change impacts due to the continuing evolution of this topic; quantification of traffic, air quality, and noise impacts in the alternatives analysis; add-on analysis related to changes in schedule and level of detail; and the addition of extra meeting time with staff.
- An increase in the budget for the traffic consultant (Fehr and Peers) of approximately \$7,500 for changes in the traffic modeling related to the alternatives and to more refined land use numbers for the project.

The increased costs for both Fehr and Peers and LSA would be largely offset by the savings realized from concluding the DCE contract. Additional funding will have to be identified for the additional cost of the Tschudin Consulting Group contract.

### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Based on comments received during an extensive public outreach process, including those from the County Planning Commission, the staff recommends a number of modifications and clarifications to the Draft General Plan (see Attachment A, Proposed Revised Draft General Plan). Changes to the Draft General Plan provided to the public on September 10, 2008, are shown in underline (additions) and ~~strike-out~~ (deletions) format. A formal action by the Board of Supervisors to accept these recommended modifications is requested prior to completion and release of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

### **RECOMMENDATION FOR CONDUCT OF MEETINGS**

A detailed agenda has been prepared for each day of the three workshops (see Attachment B, Detailed Agendas for the Board of Supervisors Workshops). With the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors the format for these workshops will be as follows, for each chapter of the Draft General Plan:

- Brief staff presentation
- Receive public testimony
- Conduct Board deliberations
- Provide Board of Supervisor direction in the form of separate straw votes on each chapter
- Provide overall direction at the conclusion of the workshops

### **RELEASE OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2008 DRAFT GENERAL PLAN**

The Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan was released on September 10, 2008. It incorporates the Board of Supervisors Preferred Land Use Plan from September 18, 2007 (as depicted on the Land Use Map [Figure LU-1] and in various land use tables [Table LU-5]), together with goals, policies, and actions developed by the staff based on prior Board direction. A detailed overview of the Draft General Plan was provided to the public at a joint workshop of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission held September 16, 2008. It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors and interested public review the staff report from that presentation, which is available online at the County General Plan website [www.yolocountygeneralplan.org](http://www.yolocountygeneralplan.org).

## **WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS**

Since the September 16, 2009 joint public workshop, 29 additional community meetings, scoping meetings, and workshops have been held. Attachment C (Summary of Public and Agency Workshops and Meetings) provides a summary of the comments and suggestions received at these meetings.

October 1	Capay Valley Advisory Committee
October 1	Sacramento County Planning Department
October 2	Madison Community Advisory Committee
October 2	Solano County Planning Department
October 2	Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
October 7	Davis City Council
October 8	Knights Landing Community Advisory Council
October 8	Napa County Planning Department
October 8	Yolo Resource Conservation District
October 9	Clarksburg Community Advisory Committee
October 13	Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Advisory Committee
October 14	Esparto Community Advisory Committee
October 15	Dunnigan Community Advisory Committee
October 16	Transportation Advisory Committee
October 20	Yolo-Zamora Community Advisory Committee
October 21	Winters City Council and City Planning Commission
October 22	Yolo County 101 – Land Use Class
October 27	Airport-West Plainfield Community Advisory Committee
October 27	Yolo County Habitat Conservation Joint Powers Agency Board
October 27	Yolo County Transportation District
October 29	CEQA Notice of Preparation Scoping Meeting
October 29	Sutter County Planning Department
October 31	Colusa County Planning Department
November 12	West Sacramento City Council
November 18	Woodland City Council
November 19	Farm Bureau Real Estate Seminar
November 20	State Department of Housing and Community Development
November 20	Delta Protection Commission
December 11	Attorney General

## **PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOPS AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Commission held workshops on the Draft General Plan policies on November 3, 5, and 6, 2008 at which time they: 1) considered written comments submitted as of that date; 2) considered comments from the public and various agencies that were provided at the workshops and meetings held through that time; 3) received oral comments from interested parties during the three-days of workshops; and, 4) deliberated to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the Draft General Plan policies. Attachment D (Planning Commission Workshop Minutes) provides the detailed actions of the Planning Commission from each of the three workshops.

In general, the Planning Commission recommended acceptance of the Draft General Plan policies, as written, with the following key modifications (these policy numbers and pages number correspond to Attachment A):

- **Principle 2.7 (page VI-1)** -- Replace reference to support for new Off-Highway Vehicle Park to support for alternative recreational facilities in general.
- **Actions PF-A9 and PF-A10 (page PF-7)** -- Tighten up requirements on new septic systems in areas near streams and/or with the potential for groundwater pollution.
- **Action AG-A6 (page AG-24)** -- Oppose limit on size of homes on Agriculture designated lands. Also allow homes to be clustered near houses on adjoining properties, and make conservation easements on the remainder of the parcel a consideration rather than mandatory.
- **Action AG-A13 (page AG-26)** -- Pursue the streamlining of State regulations to facilitate the production of energy from agricultural bio-waste.
- **Figure CO-2 (not available)** -- Move any future pedestrian/bike trail from the Deep Ship Channel to the former railroad alignment between West Sacramento and Clarksburg.

In general, the staff recommends acceptance of the Draft General Plan including the Planning Commissions recommendations. There were three significant instances where staff does not support the changes recommended by the Planning Commission. A summary of those three items and the reasoning behind the staff recommendation, is as follows (these policy numbers and pages number correspond to Attachment A):

- **Action IN-A8 (General Plan Implementation) (page IN-17)** -- The Commission recommended that a new policy be added, establishing criteria by which policies would be prioritized. It was thought that this would be especially important for policies that do not have actions associated with them, as actions will already be assigned a priority as a part of the Implementation Plan. Staff believes that while it is appropriate to prioritize actions, as they involve the allocation of staff resources and funding to carry out, policies play a different role.

Policies identify those critical social interests that need to be balanced in making a decision. How they are balanced depends on the nature of the request, the circumstances, the public's input, and the values of the decision makers involved. For instance, protecting the environment and promoting economic development are both policies. One is not prioritized over the other, as the two are interdependent. The General Plan Elements and their policy framework is equally weighted in recognition of the complex interplay of our values. It would be challenging to prepare a set of criteria to establish priorities that would always fit the situation, and it would limit the ability of the Board of Supervisors and others from using their judgment in making just decisions.

- **Policy AG-2.9 (Agriculture/Habitat Buffer) (page AG-18)** -- The Commission recommended establishing a specific minimum buffer of 300 feet between new habitat areas and adjoining agricultural lands. The buffer would be located within the habitat area. The intent of this change was to ensure that nearby farmers would not be restricted in their practices (including the application of pesticides and herbicides) as a result of the establishment of new habitat mitigation or wildlife preserve. The issue of whether or not habitat should be regulated under the County General Plan or Zoning Code is one that has not yet been decided by the Board of Supervisors and staff believes that the Commissions' recommendation is not yet supported by policy direction.
- **Action AG-A6 (Controls on Farm Dwellings) (page AG-24)** -- The Commission recommended deleting any limit on the size of rural homes, viewing such action as a disproportionate imposition on property rights. This was debated at length by the Board of Supervisors and was specifically included in the Preferred Land Use Alternative. The purpose of the limit is to discourage the construction of "McMansions" or other non-agriculturally related houses on farmland. Since this

was a specific direction by the Board of Supervisors, staff did not include the Commission recommendation in the revised Draft General Plan provided in Attachment A.

## **GENERAL PLAN LAND USE CHANGES**

In September of 2007 the Board of Supervisors authorized the staff to move forward with various land use changes referred to as the Preferred Land Use Alternative. The changes consisted primarily of new growth in Dunnigan, Madison, Elkhorn, and Spreckels. The Preferred Land Use Alternative would allow for about 26,300 people, 9,400 homes, and another 920 acres of economic development on top of that through the year 2030. The table below summarizes these numbers.

<b>Scenario</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Dwelling Units</b>	<b>Commercial and Industrial*</b>
Existing Developed	23,265	7,263	431 acres
Build-out of 1983 GP	11,240	4,014	1,440 acres
Cumulative Under 1983 GP	34,505	11,277	1,870 acres
Added Under Pref LU Alt	26,306	9,395	919 acres
Dunnigan	21,000	7,500	450 acres
Madison	3,654	1,305	131 acres
Elkhorn	0	0	305 acres
Spreckels	0	0	69 acres
Other	1,652	590	-36 acres
Cumulative Total	60,811	20,672	2,789 acres

\*Modified based on corrected 2030 mapping. Does not include agricultural industrial or agricultural commercial which can be developed within the AG designation.

In addition, as a result of changes in the density ranges for the residential land use designations proposed for use in the Draft General Plan, there are some areas throughout the County that will be able to develop/redevelop with more residential units than would be allowed currently under the 1983 General Plan. A total of 1,067 units (above and beyond the new development specifically identified in the Preferred Land Use Alternative) may be realized as a result of this.

- 34.4 acres in Esparto designated Very Low Density Residential (1-3du/ac) under the 1983 General Plan will be designated Rural Residential (1du/5ac to <1du/ac) for a net loss of 69 potential units.
- 26.9 acres in Madison designated Residential Low Density ( $\leq 6$ du/net ac) under the 1983 General Plan will be designated Residential Low (1du/ac to <10du/ac) for a net gain of 108 potential units.
- 88.6 acres in Knights Landing designated Residential Low Density (Knights Landing) ( $\leq 6$ du/net ac) under the 1983 General Plan will be designated Residential Low (1du/ac to <10du/ac) for a net gain of 354 potential units.
- 8.2 acres in Knights Landing designated Residential Medium Density (Dunnigan) (7-12du/net ac) under the 1983 General Plan will be designated Residential Medium (10du/ac to <20du/ac) for a net gain of 66 potential units.

- 76.0 acres in Dunnigan designated Residential Medium Density (Dunnigan) (12du/ac) under the 1983 General Plan will be designated Residential Medium (10du/ac to <20du/ac) for a net gain of 608 potential units.

Finally, since release of the Draft General Plan in September 2008, the staff has been working on improving the accuracy of the 2030 land use mapping including more accurately reflecting existing land uses using the proposed new land use designations. The most substantive examples have included correctly designating open space lands, park lands, and public and quasi-public facilities where they already exist. The 2030 land use map reflects these changes that correct the 1983 data base.

A revised land use map and summary accounting of all of these changes are under preparation for the Revised Draft General Plan and will be analyzed in the Draft Program EIR (see Attachment F, Revised Land Use Tables). The following table summarizes these changes:

**General Plan Summary Comparison of Land Use (1983 to 2030) (in acres)**

Land Use Categories	1983 ac	2030 ac	Difference
<b>Open Space</b>	<b>2,722</b>	<b>52,969</b>	<b>+49,247</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>603,544</b>	<b>544,723</b>	<b>-58,821</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	<b>1,121</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>-255</b>
<b>Residential</b>	<b>3,237</b>	<b>3,088</b>	<b>-149</b>
Residential Rural (1du/5ac to <1du/ac)	1668	1,602	-66
Residential Low (1du/ac to <10du/ac)	1342	1,280	-62
Residential Med (10du/ac to < 20du/ac)	196	179	-17
Residential High ( $\geq$ 20 du/ac)	31	27	-4
<b>Commercial</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>+245</b>
Commercial General	263	532	+269
Commercial Local	143	119	-24
<b>Industrial</b>	<b>1,195</b>	<b>1,049</b>	<b>-146</b>
<b>Public</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>7,001</b>	<b>+6,307</b>
<b>Specific Plan</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>3,285</b>	<b>+3,140</b>
<b>Other (roadways, railroads, highways)</b>	<b>8,160</b>	<b>8,592</b>	<b>+432</b>
<b>TOTAL (unincorporated county)</b>	<b>621,224</b>	<b>621,224</b>	<b>0</b>

As indicated in the above table, the total amount of land designated as Agriculture would decrease approximately 2.5 percent as a result of the 2030 General Plan. The majority of this change (83.7 percent) is accounted for by Open Space, primarily the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area (16,858 acres) and the public lands located at the western boundary of the County, along the Blue Ridge (29,059 acres).

Another 10.7 percent of the decrease is made up of lands being designated as Public/Quasi-Public, the largest of which is the campus of the University of California at Davis (4,355 acres), as well as the County Central Landfill/City of Davis Wastewater Treatment Plant (915 acres) and the DQ University campus (635 acres).

The actual total amount of land converted to urban uses in the 2030 General Plan is 3,132 acres, which represents 0.5 percent of land currently designated as Agriculture. The Agriculture designation includes a substantial acreage of land that is rangeland for cattle, sheep, and other

livestock. As a percentage of existing cultivated agriculture, the total amount of new proposed urban land would be 0.7 percent.

**PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Comments on the Draft General Plan were accepted through November 20, 2008. Letters from 76 agencies and individuals were received (see Attachment E, List of Commenters) that included over 500 pages of comments. Correspondence was received from one of the six adjoining counties, three of the four cities, four of the seven community advisory councils, several regional agencies including the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and one state agency (California Department of Housing and Community Development, HCD). In addition three late comments were received and have also been included, for a total of 79 letters on the Draft General Plan. This does not include comments on the CEQA Notice of Preparation which is discussed separately below.

These letters were assembled in a package and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2008 (late letters followed individually as received). A copy of this packet is referenced as a part of this staff report (Attachment E), on file with the Clerk of the Board, and available at the Planning Department.

Each comment letter has been individually reviewed by staff and the consultant team, and the proposed Revised Draft General Plan provided for consideration by the Board of Supervisors (Attachment A) reflects revisions that take these comments into account. In total, the comments received were generally supportive of the Draft General Plan as released. There were a handful of key areas of concern or disagreement that are summarized below, along with the staff-recommended approach to each item (these policy numbers and pages number correspond to Attachment A):

■ **Policy CC-3.6 (Dunnigan Density) (page LU-33)** -- Both residents and potential developers of the Dunnigan Specific Plan have commented strongly that the target residential density in this policy, as reflected in Table LU-10, of eight units per net acre is too high. The Dunnigan Advisory Committee believes that higher densities will detract from the rural setting of the community. The Committee recommended reducing High Density Residential to 17 units per acre. The developers landowner group have expressed their belief that there will not be sufficient market demand to sell higher density housing in the amounts being required. Staff strongly recommends not changing the density in Dunnigan (or elsewhere countywide) for several reasons:

1) Community Infrastructure and Infrastructure -- If density is reduced, without an increase in the growth boundary (development footprint) of the community, the total number of housing units will be less than projected. The number of 7,500 units was approved by the Board of Supervisors primarily to ensure that there is sufficient population in Dunnigan to support medical facilities, schools, sewer and water infrastructure community-wide, grocery stores, professional fire fighting, and other services and amenities. By reducing this number, these benefits may not be achieved.

2) Transit Service-- The target of eight units per net acre is considered the minimum necessary to support bus service, which will be critical to ensure that Dunnigan development has access to regional transit opportunities.

3) Jobs/Housing Balance – The number of jobs and the number of homes on Dunnigan (as with the other Specific Plan areas in the Draft General Plan) are required to be correlated in three important ways: a) jobs/housing balance -- there must be a minimum of 1.2 jobs per home so that



there are enough job available to fully employ all residents; b) jobs/housing match – to the greatest extent feasible, the wages of the jobs created must match up to the sales prices of the homes built; and c) jobs/housing phasing – the number of homes built in each development phase must generally be matched by the creation of an associated number of jobs, before a new phase of housing can be built. This unique trio of policies is fundamental to the Dunnigan growth being viewed as “smart growth”. Modification to the housing side of the equation will adversely affect the jobs/housing ratio, and thereby impair all three of these relationships.

4) Blueprint Consistency – The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) has issued a finding of consistency with the Blueprint, and a letter of support for the Dunnigan project based on all of the factors listed here. Based on preliminary discussions with SACOG staff, modification of these fundamental tenets (including decrease in density) would substantially affect their position on the project.

5) Housing Density -- Under new regulations adopted by the State Housing and Community Development Department, in order for jurisdictions to receive credit for affordable housing, they must have density that allows for a minimum of 20 units per acre.

6) Market Conditions v. Land Use Vision – It is not unusual for current market conditions to be different from the land use vision for an area. In basic terms, market conditions reflect what “sold yesterday”, and the General Plan land use map reflects what the County wants to achieve over the next 20 years. They are two very different things and it is important to ensure that the General Plan reflects the land use vision and not market conditions, which will undoubtedly change many times over the next two decades.

7) Climate Change – Community design has a huge effect on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change. The majority of California’s GHG emissions are the result of low density, remote, suburban types of growth patterns that “force” residents into their cars. The Yolo Board of Supervisors has been making wise land use decisions for years that support compact communities. The residential densities and land use balance in this Draft General Plan have been structured to support this wise legacy and lead to reductions in GHGs. A change in the densities in Dunnigan would reverse this direction.

8) Smart Growth – The SACOG staff have expressed previously, that the County’s General Plan and the Dunnigan Specific Plan in particular, depending on the final form at adoption, may serve as a model for “smart growth” and sustainable rural development, in the region. Staff has also held preliminary discussions with the Attorney General’s staff on the Draft General Plan, the County’s history and approach, and the likely climate change implications of the County’s proposed land uses, goals, policies, and actions. The AG staff appears to support the County on these issues as well, and seemed favorable towards acknowledging the County as a leader in terms of growth management. Changes to the Dunnigan densities would likely alter this favorable position in which the County finds itself

- **Policy CC-3.13 (Esparto Land Use Changes) (page LU-37)** -- The Esparto Advisory Committee and the Farm Bureau both oppose changing the existing designation of Industrial on 75 acres in southern Esparto to a mixture of Residential, Commercial and Open Space uses. As this was part of the Board of Supervisors’ Preferred Land Use Alternative, no change was made.

In addition, the representative of the property’s owner submitted comments indicating that the current designation is too restrictive and is insufficiently flexible to meet changing market demands. He asked for a Mixed Use designation that would allow either up to 70 percent of the site to be developed as Industrial/Commercial or up to 70 percent to be developed as Residential.

The choice would be the developer's. This would also require a reduced agricultural buffer or for the buffer to be located on adjoining farmland.

The Draft General Plan does not currently include a Mixed Use designation that is consistent with the owner's request and it would be inappropriate to create one solely for this project. The equivalent designation would be Specific Plan, which would provide flexibility in determining how the site would eventually be developed. The Specific Plan designation is already recommended for new growth areas in Dunnigan, Madison, Knights Landing, and Elkhorn. However, the owner is looking to develop the site in the near-term and wishes to avoid the one to two year specific plan process. For these reasons he has rejected the Specific Plan designation for the site. Consequently, staff has not made any change to this policy.

- **Figure LU-2 (Community of Brooks) (not available)** -- In their comment letter, the Rumsey Tribe of Winton Indians requested that a growth boundary be established for the community of Brooks. The purpose would be to accommodate housing for farm workers and employees of the casino resort, as well as to develop a viable rural commercial center, including tourist services. This was not included in the Board of Supervisors' preferred land use alternative. More importantly, the County's historical planning approach has been to minimize urban development in the Capay Valley, due to concerns about limited highway capacity, limited groundwater availability, potential groundwater pollution, air quality, and high fire risk potential. In addition, increased urban development could potentially conflict with the local designation of State Route 16 as a scenic highway. While the site of the casino/resort has been recommended for designation as Commercial General, no change has been made to create a growth boundary for Brooks.
- **Action AG-A6 (Controls on Farm Dwellings) (page AG-24)** -- As with the Planning Commission, there was significant opposition to the idea of placing restrictions on the size and/or location of rural homes. It is generally felt that such an action is an imposition on property rights and indirectly discourages agri-tourism uses such as wineries and bed and breakfasts. As previously explained, this was debated at length by the Board of Supervisors and was specifically included in the Preferred Land Use Alternative. Although staff did include refinements to the language and intent of the action, the limits and restrictions remain, as directed.
- **Policy PF-4.6 (Reentry Facility) (page PF-14)** -- This policy commits the county to work with the state to locate and operate the proposed re-entry facility. There were numerous comments opposing the proposed location of the facility in Madison, even though this policy does not specify where the project would be located. The Board of Supervisors has repeatedly made clear their support for the re-entry facility and no change has been made to this policy.
- **Action CO-A26 (Natural Heritage Program) (page CO-36)** -- This policy requires the County to adopt and implement the Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). Several commenters have raised a concern that the State and Federal funding may become more difficult to obtain due to ongoing government deficits. They believe the General Plan, as originally drafted relies too heavily on implementation of the NCCP/HCP as the basis for the Conservation Element framework. The comment was also made that the Conservation Element should be broadly expanded, to protect and restore the historical extent of natural habitat, instead of focusing primarily on endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.

To address the first issue staff hired a biologist familiar with Yolo County, to review and rewrite the Biological Resources Section of the Conservation and Open Space Element. The goal of the editing was to ensure that the policies could stand alone regardless of the outcome of the NCCP/HCP process. We believe this effort has been successful. Regarding the second issue,

the staff did not make changes to the Element. The comments suggest that wildlife resources should have a higher priority than other community values. The General Plan as recommended represents a careful balancing of environmental, social, economic, and political concerns that maintains 95 percent of the unincorporated area in agriculture and open space.

- **Action CO-A84 (Groundwater Management Ordinance) (page CO-66)** -- This action considers the adoption of a groundwater management ordinance, which encountered frequent opposition. Generally, those who commented against the idea, either did not see a need for such action (the incidence of subsidence is limited, temporary water exports are beneficial to farmers), believe that other agencies already adequately fulfill this role (e.g., Water Resources Agency, Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District), or find that the regulation of groundwater may have significant adverse economic impacts on the future of agriculture and urban development. The Board of Supervisors has also debated this issue at length and has voted to initiate a public outreach program to gather input in a new draft ordinance. Although staff has modified the language to say that such an ordinance shall be considered rather than adopted, the intent of the action to move forward with a groundwater ordinance remains.
- **Action CO-A84 (Retrofit at Resale) (page CO-67)** -- This action to require retrofit of existing homes with water efficient fixtures and appliances prior to resale was widely opposed. Besides the concern for property rights, few jurisdictions in the region have a similar requirement and it was felt that this would create a comparative disadvantage for home sellers in a down market. Staff agrees and has recommended removal of the action.

## **MANDATORY AGENCY REVIEW**

The County is required by state law to coordinate with various agencies on the Draft General Plan, including a number of state agencies such as HCD. Many of those agencies have state mandated review periods for local general plans that allowed for more review time than the November 20, 2008 comment deadline set by the County. The last of those deadlines passed on November 29, 2008 and all comments received were included with the other public and agency comments summarized above.

## **HOUSING ELEMENT**

Of the seven mandatory elements of the General Plan, the Housing Element is the only one that requires "approval" by the state. Pursuant to Section 65585 of the Government Code, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to review draft local Housing Elements for compliance with state law and report on their findings. The County's draft Housing Element was received by HCD on September 26, 2008 and the comment letter from the state was received by the County on November 25, the last day of the allowed 60-day comment period.

The comment letter concludes that some additional work is needed in order for the draft element to be in compliance with the state requirements (Section 65585d). The state's comments are primarily technical in nature, focusing on either clarification of information presented in the Draft Housing Element, the inclusion of additional data that was not sufficiently detailed, and/or expanded discussions of recommended actions.

The County is required to consider the state comments and either make changes to satisfy HCD or make findings of substantial compliance despite the HCD findings (65585f). The staff is working with

the General Plan consultant, Economic Development Division, Yolo County Housing, and HCD to identify appropriate modifications to the Housing Element to satisfy HCD and achieve compliance. These efforts are in progress at the time of this writing and not expected to be completed prior to the subject January workshops. Therefore, the staff is requesting the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors that specific final modifications be left to the discretion of the Director of Planning and Public Works unless a substantive land use or policy concern arises. Should the latter occur, the staff will return to the Board for subsequent direction. In either case, the necessary changes will be included in the Final Draft General Plan to be considered by the Board of Supervisors in July.

After adoption of the Housing Element, which is currently anticipated to occur in September 2009, the County is then required to resubmit the Element to HCD at which point the State has 90 days to complete their second review. If the State concludes that the final element satisfies the legal requirements, they will issue a final letter that finds the element "in compliance". A compliant Housing Element is required in order to qualify for most housing loan and grant programs, and is necessary in order to achieve the statutory presumption of legal adequacy afforded by Section 65589.3.

## **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

As reported to the Board of Supervisors in September 2008, a key component of the Draft General Plan will be the General Plan Implementation Plan. Through the County Administrator's Office, the General Plan Team has been coordinating with all departments having implementation responsibility, to determine the following:

- Assign workload factors (estimated labor hours and staff positions) to each action item;
- Establish a priority ranking for each action item; and
- Confirm the proposed timeframe for completion of each action item.

When completed, the General Plan Implementation Program (GPIP) will integrate all of the actions within the various chapters of the General Plan into a single spreadsheet-based document. The GPIP will allow actions to be tracked and sorted in a variety of ways, for example by department responsibility, estimated cost, year of implementation, and/or General Plan element.

The GPIP is currently in administrative form and has been put on a parallel track with the County budget to allow for full integration into the County's strategic planning and fiscal process. It will be brought to the Board of Supervisors in June 2009 for consideration during the budget workshops. This timing will also allow staff to include mitigation measures that emerge from the General Plan Draft Program EIR, which may dictate timing or priority for specific actions of the General Plan.

This process will enable the Board of Supervisors, staff, and the public to better understand and consider the fiscal implications of General Plan implementation, and will allow for structured priority-setting in the future. As currently drafted, the General Plan contains over 500 separate actions. This represents an ambitious vision over the next twenty years, the implementation of which will depend largely on available resources. Allocating resources by assigning priorities to these actions is a fundamental policy decision of the Board of Supervisors that will have significant impacts on the economy, the environment, and on the county budget. Funding for completion of the implementation plans will be an important part of that decision, whether through fees, grants, partnerships, or the General Fund. Public input during future workshops and hearings is encouraged to assist the Board of Supervisors in determining implementation priorities and balancing among factors such as the degree of benefit, cost to the County (including staff time), costs to property owners, and effects on other General Plan policies and actions.

## **DRAFT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

The County's Economic Development Strategy (EDS) will be an important implementation tool for the General Plan. Though not a part of the General Plan, a draft of the EDS was circulated in September, along with the Draft General Plan, so that the public would have an opportunity to review both draft documents together. Several comments were received on the Draft EDS and those have been considered by the County Economic Development Manager. Minor revisions will be made to the Draft EDS to address these concerns and it will be brought forward to the Board of Supervisors in July for final action at the same time as the Draft General Plan.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

On September 16, 2008 the Board of Supervisors gave direction to staff to, among other things, proceed with preparation of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This work has begun including identification of project alternatives and completion of traffic, air quality, and noise impact modeling, as well as initiation of the climate change analysis.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) a detailed Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued by the County on October 8, 2009. A minimum 30-day comment period is required for the NOP; however the County accepted comments for a 43-day period that ended November 20, 2008. In addition a public and agency "scoping" meeting was held on October 29, 2008.

The NOP can be viewed in full on the General Plan website ([www.yolocountygeneralplan.org](http://www.yolocountygeneralplan.org)). Among the items included in it are a discussion of anticipated areas of environmental impact that will be analyzed in the Draft Program EIR and a description of the alternatives to the Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan that will be evaluated, as required under State law. These alternatives are as follows:

### **Summary OF CEQA Alternatives**

<b>General Plan Alternative Scenario</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Dwelling Units (DU)</b>	<b>DU Increase from Prior Scenario</b>	<b>Ind/Comm Acreage (Ac)</b>	<b>Ac Increase from Prior Scenario</b>
Setting: Existing Conditions (07)	23,265	7,263	0	431	0
No Project: 1983 GP Build-out	34,505	11,277	4,014 55%	1,870	1,439 334%
Rural Sustainability	44,926	14,241	2,964 26%	2,345	475 25%
The Project: Draft General Plan	61,105	20,657	6,416 45%	2,791	446 19%
Market Demand *	71,165	24,200	3,543 17%	3,246	455 16%

\* Source: "Market and Fiscal Considerations Report", September 2006, Bay Area Economics. Assumes 4.5 percent annual increase in households and 5.0 percent annual vacancy for the 25-year period from 2005 through 2030.

Comments on the NOP were received from eight entities (see Attachment E). Included in these is the “log in” letter from the State Clearinghouse assigning the General Plan Draft Program EIR the following control number: SCH#200812034. The NOP comment letters were assembled in a package and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2008. A copy of this packet is on file with the Clerk of the Board and available at the Planning Department. The NOP and NOP comment letters are also available for review online at the County’s General Plan website [www.yolocountygeneralplan.org](http://www.yolocountygeneralplan.org). Each comment letter has each been individually reviewed by staff and the consultant team, and none were found to change the already identified scope of work for the Draft Program EIR.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

In some areas, the staff has recommended modifications and clarifications to the Draft General Plan land uses as portrayed on the Land Use Map. These changes are consistent with the land use designation categories presented in the September 10, 2008 Draft General Plan, but were not specifically included in the Preferred Land Use Alternative. The primary instances where this occurs are as follows:

- Public lands that are primarily used for natural resource management have been designated as Open Space. This includes Bureau of Land Management forests along the Blue Ridge, the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area, the Cache Creek Nature Preserve, county parks outside of existing communities, major waterways, and agricultural buffers within communities.
- Government and community facilities have been designated as Public/Quasi-Public. These include airports, fire stations, post offices, schools, cemeteries, road corporation yards, municipal water wells, churches, libraries, utility substations, meeting halls, the University of California at Davis, DQ University, the county Central Landfill, waste water treatment plants, and other city-owned lands.
- County community parks, golf courses, recreational vehicle parks, and private parks have been designated as Parks and Recreation.

Staff has also recommended additional land use changes based on on-the-ground conditions, in order to correctly identify existing land uses in the County Geographic Information System (GIS) data base. This “clean up” will greatly improve the accuracy of the County’s land use mapping and analysis. A complete list is provided in Attachment G, Summary of Recommended Land Use Changes. The major land use changes as recommended by staff are summarized as follows.

- **Airport** -- The West Plainfield neighborhood has been changed from Residential Low Density to Rural Residential.
- **Capay** -- Several parcels in the northeast part of town have been changed from Agriculture to Residential Low Density to reflect existing uses.
- **Clarksburg** -- The western portions have been changed from Low Density Residential to Rural Residential. The neighborhood south of Sacramento Street, generally located between Riverview Drive and Center Street has been changed from Residential Medium Density to Residential Low Density. Several residential parcels have been changed from Commercial to Residential Low Density.

- **Dunnigan** -- The Hardwood Subdivision has been changed from Residential Low Density to Rural Residential. The Old Town neighborhood has been changed from Residential Medium Density to Residential Low Density. The Ritchie Brothers Auction facility has been changed from Agricultural to Industrial. The area north of County Road 6, between County Roads 89 and 99W has been changed from Public Facility to Commercial Local. The area located around the auto dismantling facility west of County Road 99 and north of County Road 5 has been changed to reflect existing uses.
- **El Macero** -- The Oaks condominium development has been changed from Residential Low Density to Residential Medium Density.
- **Esparto** -- The public housing project has been changed from Residential High Density to Residential Medium Density, as has the neighborhood directly east of the housing project. The area north of Woodland Avenue, between County Road 87 and State Route 16 has been changed from Mixed Use to Commercial General. The area northeast of the intersection of Yolo and Woodland Avenues, and the remainder of the downtown area south of Woodland Avenue, has been changed from Mixed Use to Commercial Local. Similarly, the area generally located north of County Road 21A and south of downtown has been changed from General Commercial to Commercial Local. The bicycle/pedestrian path and detention ponds in the western portion of town have been changed from Residential Low Density to Open Space. The area in the northeast part of town has been changed from Residential Very Low Density to Rural Residential.
- **Guinda** -- A parcel along the southern boundary of the community has been changed from Residential Low Density to Agriculture. Several small parcels have been changed to either Low Density Residential or Commercial Local to reflect existing uses.
- **Knights Landing** -- The Specific Plan area has been expanded to include the Employment Reserve area south of County Road 116, between the eastern edge of town and the wastewater treatment plant. A portion of the Residential High Density neighborhood located at the north end of town has been changed to Residential Medium Density. The waterfront area east of Railroad Street has been changed from Public/Quasi-Public to Parks and Recreation. The senior citizen's facility has been changed from Commercial Local to Residential High Density. The land east of Railroad Avenue and north County Road 116 has been changed from Residential Medium Density to Residential Low Density. The Residential High Density area east of the school has been changed to Residential Low Density.
- **Madison** -- The strip of land between County Road 89 and Railroad Street has been changed from Industrial and Residential Low Density to Commercial Local. The Madison Migrant Center has been changed from Agriculture to Residential Medium Density.
- **North Davis Meadows** -- The Teichert corporation yard (east of North Davis Meadows) has been changed from Agriculture to Industrial.
- **North Woodland** -- The 1983 Woodland Area General Plan designated areas north of the City of Woodland as future areas for residential and commercial development. These areas were generally located south of County Road 19B, between State Route 16 and College Street. The majority of these properties have been changed to Agriculture.

The housing neighborhood that lies along Carter Lane, between State Route 16 and Road 95B, has been change from Agriculture to Rural Residential. Similarly, the area located northwest of the intersection of West Street and Kentucky Avenue has been changed from Agriculture to

Commercial Local. The Industrial designation of the area located northeast of Cottonwood and Kentucky Avenues has been changed from Agriculture to Industrial to reflect existing uses.

- **Other** -- The Davis Migrant Center has been changed from Agriculture to Residential Medium Density. The federal and state lands on the western boundary of the County (generally along the Blue Ridge) have been changed from Agriculture to Open Space. Similarly, the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area has been changed from Agriculture to Open Space.
- **Patwin Road** -- Several small in-holding parcels have been changed from Agriculture to Rural Residential.
- **Rio Villa** -- The housing project has been changed from Agriculture to Residential Medium Density.
- **Tribal Lands** -- The Cache Creek Casino and Resort has been changed from Agriculture to Commercial General. The housing and community center for the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians has changed from Agriculture to Rural Residential.
- **Yolo** -- The majority of housing in the town of Yolo has been changed from Residential Medium Density to Residential Low Density. Changes have been made along various parcels along the railroad to make them more consistent with existing commercial and/or industrial uses.
- **Zamora** -- Several small parcels located between County Road 99W and Interstate 5 in Zamora have been changed from Agriculture to Industrial.

## **NEXT STEPS**

The target release date for the Draft Program EIR is currently early-March or 2009. The release of the Final Program EIR is expected in late May of 2009. The staff will be able to confirm this and issue a revised schedule, if necessary, following the conclusion of the subject January workshops. Additional time may be necessary dependent on the extent and scope of the Board's direction regarding the revisions to the Draft General Plan.

Final hearings before the Planning Commission are scheduled for June 10, 11, and 12, 2009. At the close of the June 2009 hearings, the Planning Commission will be asked to make a final recommendation on the General Plan and Program EIR to the Board of Supervisors. Final hearings before the Board of Supervisors are scheduled for July 20, 21, and 23, 2009. At the conclusion of the July 2009 hearings the Board of Supervisors will be asked to make an "intent motion" reflecting tentative final action on the General Plan and Program EIR. The staff will then prepare the final approval package, which will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on September 15, 2009 for final action. A revised schedule is provided in Attachment H (Revised Schedule).

## **OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

While the Planning and Public Works Department is the lead County department for the General Plan update process, the effort has and will continue to involve many of the County's departments. This has included department head updates, ongoing internal communication and coordination with affected departments, and departmental review and comment of relevant administrative and draft text and policy language. All departments with assigned implementation responsibilities are



currently coordinating through the Assistant CAO to refine and expand the General Plan Implementation Plan. Please refer to the separate discussion of this item provided above.

Additionally, there has been coordination with the CAO Climate Change team to ensure that the Draft General Plan appropriately reflects the County's aggressive stance on climate change issues, as related to land use actions. A number of modifications included in Attachment A reflect changes related to reduction of greenhouse gases and adaptation for the effects of climate change. Similarly, staff is regularly working with the Economic Development Manager to ensure that the General Plan and Economic Development Strategy are seamlessly integrated as each moves forward. The General Plan Team will also be participating in the upcoming discussions of the 2009 Strategic Plan and including any new priorities in the final Draft General Plan document.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A Proposed Revised Draft General Plan (~~strikeout~~/underline format)<sup>1</sup>
- B Detailed Agendas for Board of Supervisors Workshops
- C Summary of Public and Agency Workshops and Meetings
- D Planning Commission Workshop Minutes
- E List of Commenters (Letters are on file with the Clerk of the Board and Planning Department)
- F Revised Land Use Tables
- G Summary of Recommended Land Use Changes
- H Revised Schedule

---

<sup>1</sup> The revised land use map will be available at the workshop. All other figures are under preparation and will be available on or before the June Planning Commission hearings. The parenthetical references to policies in each of the actions may be incorrect because they still point to the numbering from the prior version of the document. They will be corrected by staff for the next version.